

### Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <a href="http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content">http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content</a>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

#### THE

# AMERICAN LAW REGISTER.

#### VOL. VI.

FROM NOVEMBER 1857—TO NOVEMBER 1858.

EDITORS:

ASA I. FISH AND HENRY WHARTON.

PHILADELPHIA:

D. B. CANFIELD & CO., GOLDSMITHS HALL, LIBRARY STREET.

1858.

Crissy & Markley, Printers, Goldsmiths Hall, Library Street.

## TABLE

 $\mathbf{0F}$ 

### LEADING ARTICLES, ETC.

Allison's, Judge, Charge in Smith's case—Law of Homicide in	
Pennsylvania Insanity as a defence,	257
Construing Statutes by Equity,	513
Coroners, Medico-Legal Duties of,	385
Legal Studies on the Continent,	577
Malice in Morals and in Law,	321
Master and Servant,	449
Negligence,	449
Ships' Lights and the Rule of the Road	1
Smith's Trial,	193
Solicitor and Client—Gift by Will,	641
Trial by Jury,	705
Uses, Doctrine of,	65
SHORT NOTES OF RECENT ENGLISH CHANCERY DECISI	ONS.
Executor's liability on Bankruptcy of Bankers—Johnson vs. Newton, Execution—Misapplication of assets by co-executor—Candler vs.	58
Tillett.	58
Injunction—Disturbance of graves purchased in perpetuity—Mor-	
land vs. Richardson,	64
Injunction—Nuisance—Brick burning—Pollock vs. Lester,	59
Legacy—Misdescription of legatee—Rickit's Trust, -	60
Married woman-No power to alien reversionary interest in per-	
sonal property subject to her own life interest-Hanchett	
vs. Briscoe,	61

Trustees can derive no profit from trust—Nicholson vs. Tutin, Trustees—Willful Default—Sleight vs. Lawson, Voluntary Trust—Declaration of intention to divide property not	62 62
a declaration of trust—Dipple vs. Corles.	63
LEGAL MISCELLANY.	
Contempt of Court,	632
Judicial Romance,  High Court of Errors and Appeals in Pennsylvania—Negro suffrage  —History of the case on negro suffrage mentioned in Hobbs  vs. Fogg, 6 Watts, 553—Some account of the High Court	
of Errors and Appeals—Its minutes, &c., -	238
NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.	
Andrews' Treatise on the Revenue Laws of the United States, -	703
Angell & Durfee on Highways,	445
Brightly's Digest of the Laws of the United States, 1789-1857,	252
Casey's Reports, Vol. IV.,	446
Casey's Reports, Vol. V,	
Davis's Argument on Insanity,	448
Drake on Attachment,	110
Dutcher's New Jersey Reports, Vol. II.,	382
Edwards on Receivers in Equity, and under the New York Code of	
Procedure,	256
Hilliard on Vendors and Purchasers,	447
Hurd's Topics of Jurisprudence,	576
Monthly Law Reporter,	512
Perkins' Indiana Digest,	704
Pierce's Treatise on American Railroad Law,	254
Prentiss on Criminal Law, Vol. II.,	$\frac{2}{446}$
Price on Liens,	- 190
Redfield's Law of Railways,	317
Robinson's Practice, Vol. III,	384
Smith's N. Y. Common Pleas Reports, Vol. III.,	320
Stockton's N. J. Chancery Reports, Vol. III.,	- 319
Story's Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States—	
Third Edition,	703
Thayer's Argument on Insanity, -	448
Thought be the grant on the annity, " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "	440

## TABLE OF CASES.

African descent, Right of Suffrage of Persons of,
Ambassador the, Johnson vs. 278 Anderson, Poindexter vs. 78 B. Ballbeck vs. Donaldson—Resulting trust when implied—Validity of parol trusts, 162 Baltimore Railroad Co., Hawley vs. 352 Baltimore Railroad Co., Hawley vs. 352 Baltimore Railroad Co., Hawley vs. 352 Baltimore Railroad Co., Hawley vs. 354 Barber, Mad River Railroad vs. 534 Bee vs. The Minnie, 328 Bigelow vs. New Jersey Railroad, 68 Briscoe, Hanchett vs. 61 Blanchard, Wood vs. 434 Born vs. Shaw—Fraud in sale of chattels—Place of contract—Attachment by creditor—Validity of sale—Title of vendee—Opinion per Lewis, C. J., 236 Brig Caroline, Virden, vs. 222 Brown Bros., John Murdock vs. 690 Brig Arbustei—Justi Pon et al vs. 511 Cabeen vs. Campbell—Stoppage in transitu—Constructive delivery—when the transitus of goods is ended—Opinion per Thompson, J., 561 Cahill vs. Dawson—Principal and agent—Right of action for breach of instructions—Broker employing third person. 176 Camp vs. Telegraph Company, 443, 734 Campbell, Cabeen vs. 561 Campbell', Cabeen vs. 561 Campbell', Cabeen vs. 561 Campbell, Cabeen vs. 561 Campbell', Cabeen vs. 561 Carryl, Taylor vs. 646 Candler vs. Tillett, 58 Carryl, Taylor vs. 646 Delaware Railroad Co., Hawley vs. 361 construing charter—No lien unless party claiming it is in possession Mode of adjusting liens—Jurisdiction of Chancery—Appointment of receiver—Injunction—Opinion per McLean, J. 27 Commins vs. The Minnie, 328 Com. vs. Freeth—Insanity—Thetest in homicide cases—Partial insanity—Hallucination—Delusion—Charge per Ludlow, J., 400 Conover vs. Mayor, &c., of New York—Conflict of Jurisdiction— Injunction against equitable proceedings, 131 Corles, Dipple vs. Cresson—Will—Interpretation of special clause—What is a charitable use in Pennsylvania—Trust—Establishment of a trust by a court of equity—Peculiar cases establishing charitable trusts cited and commented on—Opinion per Kane, J., 42 Crocker, Mowry, vs. 737 Cummings vs Mead—Negotiable paper—Fraud in putting in circulation—Consideration—Payment—Collection of debt—Badges of fraud—Opi
B. Ballbeck vs. Donaldson—Resulting trust when implied—Validity of parol trusts,
B. Ballbeck vs. Donaldson—Resulting trust when implied—Validity of parol trusts,
Ballbeck vs. Donaldson—Resulting trust when implied—Validity of parol trusts,
Ballbeck vs. Donaldson—Resulting trust when implied—Validity of parol trusts,
trust when implied—Validity of parol trusts,
trust when implied—Validity of parol trusts,
parol trusts
Ballis, Hill vs
Baltimore Railroad Co., Hawley vs. 352 Baltimore Railroad, O'Brien vs
Bank of Pittsburg's Appeal,
Barber, Mad River Railroad vs
Bee vs. The Minnie,
Bigelow vs. New Jersey Railroad, Briscoe, Hanchett vs
Briscoe, Hanchett vs
Blanchard, Wood vs
Born vs. Shaw—Fraud in sale of chattels—Place of contract—Attachment by creditor—Validity of sale—Title of vendee—Opinion per Lewis, C. J.,
chattels—Place of contract—Attachment by creditor—Validity of sale—Title of vendee—Opinion per Lewis, C. J.,
tachment by creditor—Validity of sale—Title of vendee—Opinion per Lewis, C. J.,
sale—Title of vendee—Opinion per Lewis, C. J.,
per Lewis, C. J.,
Brig Caroline, Virden, vs
Brown Bros., John Murdock vs
Brig Arbustei—Justi Pon et al vs 511  C.  Cabeen vs. Campbell—Stoppage in transitu—Constructive delivery—when the transitus of goods is ended—Opinion per Thompson, J., 561 Cahill vs. Dawson—Principal and agent—Right of action for breach of instructions—Broker employing third person, 176 Camp vs. Telegraph Company, 443, 734 Campbell, Cabeen vs. 561 Campbell's Appeal, 575 Carrl, Taylor vs. 646  by a court of equity—Peculiar cases establishing charitable trusts cited and commented on—Opinion per Kane, J., 42 Crocker, Mowry, vs. 578 Cummings vs Mead—Negotiable paper—Fraud in putting in circulation—Consideration—Payment—Collection of debt—Badges of fraud—Opinion per Miller, J., 551 Dawson, Cahill vs. 176 Dawson, Cahill vs. 176 Day, Goodyear vs. 632 Dillon, Webster, vs. 174 Dipple vs. Corles, 632 Delaware Ins. Co., Winter vs. 572 Delaware Railroad Co., Reeves vs. 565
Cabeen vs. Campbell—Stoppage in transitu—Constructive delivery—when the transitus of goods is ended—Opinion per Thompson, J., 561 Cahill vs. Dawson—Principal and agent—Right of action for breach of instructions—Broker employing third person, 176 Camp vs. Telegraph Company, 443, 734 Campbell, Cabeen vs. 561 Canibell, Cabeen vs. 561 Canibell vs. Trowbridge, 740 Carlin vs. Trowbridge, 740 Carlor vs. Tilett, 58 Carryl, Taylor vs. 646
Cabeen vs. Campbell—Stoppage in transitu—Constructive delivery—when the transitus of goods is ended—Opinion per Thompson, J., 561 Cahill vs. Dawson—Principal and agent—Right of action for breach of instructions—Broker employing third person, 176 Camp vs. Telegraph Company, 443, 734 Campbell, Cabeen vs. 561 Carlin vs. Trowbridge, 740 Candler vs. Tillett, 58 Carryl, Taylor vs. 646
Cabeen vs. Campbell—Stoppage in transitu—Constructive delivery—when the transitus of goods is ended—Opinion per Thompson, J., 561 Cahill vs. Dawson—Principal and agent—Right of action for breach of instructions—Broker employing third person, 176 Camp vs. Telegraph Company, 443, 734 Campbell, Cabeen vs. 561 Campbell's Appeal, 751 Carlin vs. Trowbridge, 740 Candler vs. Tillett, 58 Carryl, Taylor vs. 646
Cabeen vs. Campbell—Stoppage in transitu—Constructive delivery—when the transitus of goods is ended—Opinion per Thompson, J., 561 Cahill vs. Dawson—Principal and agent—Right of action for breach of instructions—Broker employing third person, 176 Camp vs. Telegraph Company, 443, 734 Campbell, Cabeen vs. 561 Campbell's Appeal, 751 Carlin vs. Trowbridge, 740 Candler vs. Tillett, 58 Carryl, Taylor vs. 646  Crocker, Mowry, vs. 737 Cummings vs Mead—Negotiable paper—Fraud in putting in circulation—Consideration—Payment—Collection of debt—Badges of fraud—Opinion per Miller, J., 51  Dawson, Cahill vs. 176 Day, Goodyear vs. 632 Dillon, Webster, vs. 174 Dipple vs. Corles, 632 Delaware Ins. Co., Winter vs. 572 Delaware Railroad Co., Reeves vs. 565
transitu—Constructive delivery —when the transitus of goods is ended—Opinion per Thompson, J., 561 Cahill vs. Dawson—Principal and agent—Right of action for breach of instructions—Broker employ- ing third person,
—when the transitus of goods is ended—Opinion per Thompson, J., 561 Cahill vs. Dawson—Principal and agent—Right of action for breach of instructions—Broker employing third person, 176 Camp vs. Telegraph Company, 443, 734 Campbell, Cabeen vs. 561 Campbell's Appeal, 751 Carlin vs. Trowbridge, 740 Candler vs. Tilett, 58 Carryl, Taylor vs. 646
ended—Opinion per Thompson, J., 561 Cahill vs. Dawson—Principal and agent—Right of action for breach of instructions—Broker employing third person, 176 Camp vs. Telegraph Company, 443, 734 Campbell, Cabeen vs. 561 Campbell's Appeal, 751 Carlin vs. Trowbridge, 740 Candler vs. Tilett, 58 Carryl, Taylor vs. 646
Cahill vs. Dawson—Principal and agent—Right of action for breach of instructions—Broker employing third person,       —Collection of debt—Badges of fraud—Opinion per Miller, J., '51         Camp vs. Telegraph Company, 443, 734       Dawson, Cahill vs
agent—Right of action for breach of instructions—Broker employing third person,       176       fraud—Opinion per Miller, J.,       51         Camp vs. Telegraph Company, 443, 734       Dawson, Cahill vs.       176         Campbell, Cabeen vs.       561       Day, Goodyear vs.       632         Campbell's Appeal,       740       Dipple vs. Corles,       63         Carlin vs. Trowbridge,       740       Delaware Ins. Co., Winter vs.       572         Carryl, Taylor vs.       646       Delaware Railroad Co., Reeves vs.       565
of instructions—Broker employing third person,       176         Camp vs. Telegraph Company, 443, 734       Dawson, Cahill vs.       176         Campbell, Cabeen vs.       561       Day, Goodyear vs.       632         Campbell's Appeal,       751       Dillon, Webster, vs.       174         Carlin vs. Trowbridge,       740       Dipple vs. Corles,       63         Candler vs. Tillett,       58       Delaware Ins. Co., Winter vs.       572         Carryl, Taylor vs.       646       Delaware Railroad Co., Reeves vs.       565
ing third person,       176       D.         Camp vs. Telegraph Company, 443, 734       Dawson, Cahill vs.       176         Campbell, Cabeen vs.       561       Day, Goodyear vs.       632         Campbell's Appeal,       751       Dillon, Webster, vs.       174         Carlin vs. Trowbridge,       740       Dipple vs. Corles,       63         Candler vs. Tillett,       58       Delaware Ins. Co., Winter vs.       572         Carryl, Taylor vs.       646       Delaware Railroad Co., Reeves vs.       565
Camp vs. Telegraph Company, 443, 734       Dawson, Cahill vs
Campbell, Cabeen vs.       561       Day, Goodyear vs.       632         Campbell's Appeal,       751       Dillon, Webster, vs.       174         Carlin vs. Trowbridge,       740       Dipple vs. Corles,       63         Candler vs. Tillett,       58       Delaware Ins. Co., Winter vs.       572         Carryl, Taylor vs.       646       Delaware Railroad Co., Reeves vs.       565
Campbell's Appeal,       751       Dillon, Webster, vs.       174         Carlin vs. Trowbridge,       740       Dipple vs. Corles,       63         Candler vs. Tillett,       58       Delaware Ins. Co., Winter vs.       572         Carryl, Taylor vs.       646       Delaware Railroad Co., Reeves vs.       565
Carlin vs. Trowbridge,
Carryl, Taylor vs
Cin. Ham. & Dav. R. R., C. James vs. 718 Donaldson, Ballbeck vs. 148
City of Maysville, William A.
Graham vs
City of Milwaukie, Lumsden vs 157
Coakley vs. the North Pennsylvania Erie Canal Co. vs. Lowry, 750
Railroad—Liability of principal
for conduct of agent—Act of 1855 F.
providing remedy in case of death by negligence—Construction of Freeth, Com. vs
the act Mode of estimating dam -
the act—Mode of estimating dam- ages—Measure of damages—Sug-
ages—Measure of damages—Sug-
ages—Measure of damages—Suggestions as to money value of

Goodyear vs. Day—Sale of patent pending litigation and application		Hurd, Ludlow vs	493
for an injunction no contempt of court—History of the law of con- tempt in the United States courts —Act of March 2, 1851—Report per Green, Master,		I. Illinois Railroad, Rodney vs Insurance Company vs. Reed—Mort- gage—Power of attorney—When agent's act is act of the pirncipal	439
Graham vs. the City of Maysville		-True consideration of mortgage	
and others—Subscription to a railroad by a city corporation— Bonds issued by authority of an		—Usury—Special plea—Statutes of limitation in chancery—Stale demand—Equity of redemption—	
act of Assembly by city corpo- ration — Substantial compliance with terms of act and of charter		Powers of courts of equity—Opin- ion per Miller, J	406
all that is required-Constitutional		J.	
provisions—Innocent bondholders		James vs. The Cin. Ham. & Day.	
-Failure of railroad scheme no evidence of fraud-Interpretation		R. R.—Stock subscription—Ex- ecutory contract—Assignment of	
of railroad charter-Duty of City		contract—Foreign law is matter	
Councils-Duty of Mayor of city-		of Fact-Powers of corporation-	
Form of the bonds—Semi-annual		Character of organization of rail-	
payment of interest—Injunction —Duty to lay and collect tax for		road corporation—Change in cha- acter of contract,	
specific purpose — Mandamus—		Johnson vs. The Ambassador	273
When proper remedy—When court		Jones, Richmond Railroad vs	
will issue—Opinion per Phister, J.,	590	Justi Pon et al vs. Brig Arbustei,	511
н.		L.	
TT 1 11 TH. T	0.1	Lawson, Slight vs	62
Hanchett vs. Briscoe,	61	Leitch vs. The George Law-Licensed	
-Collision-Mutual fault-Look-		Pilot — Pilotage service — State regulations—Non liability of ship	
out on deck of steamboat, when		in rem—Opinion per Betts, J	368
necessary-Rules of navigation-		Lester, Pollock vs	59
Opinion per Giles, J.,	422	Lewis, Morris Canal Company vs	
Hawley vs. The Baltimore Railroad		London Railway the, Tooney vs	
Company—Railroad company not responsible for unskillfulness or		Louisiana the, Haney vs	
carelessness of employees whereby		Lowry, Erie Canal Co., vs	
co employee is injured-Duty as		Ludlow vs. Hurd,	
to selection of employees—Opin-		Lumsden vs. City of Milwaukee-	
ion per Thompson, J.,	352	Constitutional law—Private pro-	157
Hill vs. Balls—Action on the case— Sale of diseased animal—Auction,	162	perty taken for public uses,	191
Hill vs. The Golden Gate—General	-02	М.	
maritime liens-Supplies to ship	Ì	Maddox, Graham vs	581
in home port—Judicial sale will		Mad River Railroad vs. Barber-	
discharge liens — General and statutory liens — The Boat Acts on		Action by conductor for injury	
the western rivers—Their opera-		while in charge of train—Duty of employer to furnish reasonable	
tion-cases cited and commented		and fit machinery, but not to guar-	
on-Foreign or domestic character	1	antce its sufficiency, nor safety of	
of vessel—Owner's residence—		the cars and machinery-Nature	
Charterer's residence — Legisla- tive action on maritime liens—		and hazard of the employment—	
Admiralty sale — Opinion per	- 1	Duty of conductor, as supervisory agent, to inspect cars, machin-	
Treat, D. J., Catron, Circuit Judge,	1	ery and apparatus—Company, as	
concurring,	273	between themselves and conductor,	
Holmes, M'Cready vs	229	not liable for unknown defects—	
Defence — Accommodation paper	- 1	The mode in which the plaintiff should state the allegations of in-	
-Business paper-Unincorpora-		jury—Duty of railway company—	
ted company's promissory note-	1	When conductor assumes risk, and	
Title-Action-Opinion per Thomp-		waives obligation of company-	
son, J	482	Opinion per Bartley, C. J	534

Marsh vs. The Minnie-Commins vs.	New Jersey Railroad, Bigelow vs	6
the same—Bee vs. the same—	New Jersey Railroad, Milnor vs	6
Smyzer vs. the same—Maritime	New Jersey Railroad, Shardlow vs	6
law—Lien in home port—Credit	New York Railroad The, Wells vs	
-Supplies-Lien for repairs-	Nicholson vs. Tutin,	62
Custody of vessel-Mortgage of	North Pennsylvania Railroad, Coak-	
ship-Mortgage act of 1850-	ley vs	355
Lien of Material-man in possession	•	
-Marshaling liens-Claim in rem	0.	
-Opinion per McGrath, J., 328	O'Brien vs. The Baltimore Railroad	
Mayor of New York, Conover vs 131	—Plaintiff's negligence prevents	
M'Cready vs. Holmes—Carrier—Bill	recovery - Negligence defined	
of lading—Freight—Delivery of	Duty of person about to cross rail-	
goods transported — Burden of	road track at grade, on which	
proof-Wrongful act of carrier-	locomotives run — Opinion per	
NeglectOpinion per M'Grath, J., 229	Woodward J.,	361
Mead, Cummings vs, 51	Orient Insurance Co., Wright vs	485
Middleton, Raymond vs 377		
Milnor vs. Newark Plank Road—	TD.	
	P.	457
-Jurisdiction of the United States	Patton, Vicksburg Railroad vs	407
Courts to restrain erection of	Paul, Holmes vs	482
bridge over navigable river within	Pennock and the Cleveland, Zanes-	
the limits of a State, denied—Con-	ville and Cincinnati Railroad Co.,	
struction of certain acts of legis-	Coe vs	27
lation in New Jersey-Exercise	Poindexter vs. Anderson-Conflict	
of right of eminent domain in erect-	of Laws-Slavery-Effect of tran-	
		78
ing bridges — Franchise—Toll—	sit on personal status,	78
Vesting of franchise in corpora-	Pollock vs. Lester,	59
tions—Contract as to line of road	Proceeds of the Arbustei, Justi	
-Change of direction of line of	Pon vs	510
route—Opinion per Grier, J 6		
Minnie the, Bee vs 328	R.	
Minnie the, Commins vs 328		
Minnie the, Commins vs	Raymond vs. Middleton—Negoti-	
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	Raymond vs. Middleton—Negoti-	
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument-Words of nego-	
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of nego- tiability—Special restriction on	
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of nego- tiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorse-	0==
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of nego- tiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorse- ment—Opinion per Porter, J	
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of nego- tiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorse- ment—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs	342
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of nego- tiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorse- ment—Opinion per Porter, J	342
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of nego- tiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorse- ment—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs	$\frac{342}{406}$
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs	$\frac{342}{406}$
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad	$\frac{342}{406}$
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of	$\frac{342}{406}$
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J  Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs  Reed, Insurance Company vs  Reed, Runyan vs  Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at	$\frac{342}{406}$
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J  Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs  Reed, Insurance Company vs  Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both	$\frac{342}{406}$
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence,	342 406 305
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J  Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs  Reed, Insurance Company vs  Reed, Runyan vs  Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway —Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary	342 406 305
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J  Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs  Reed, Insurance Company vs  Reed, Runyan vs  Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing	342 406 305
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J  Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs  Reed, Insurance Company vs  Reed, Runyan vs  Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—	342 406 305
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J  Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs  Reed, Insurance Company vs  Reed, Runyan vs  Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing	342 406 305
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J  Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs  Reed, Insurance Company vs  Reed, Runyan vs  Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J	342 406 305 565
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J Rex vs. Lomamn,	342 406 305 565
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J Rex vs. Lomamn, Richardson, Morland vs	342 406 305 565 745
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J Rex vs. Lomamn, Richardson, Morland vs Richmond Railroad vs. Jones—Re-	342 406 305 565 745
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J Rex vs. Lomann,	342 406 305 565 745
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J Rex vs. Lomann, Richardson, Morland vs. Jones—Responsibility of railroad same as that of natural person—True	342 406 305 565 745
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J	342 406 305 565 745
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J Rex vs. Lomamn,	342 406 305 565 745
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J  Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J Rex vs. Lomann,———————————————————————————————————	342 406 305 565 745
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J  Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J Richardson, Morland vs Richardson, Morland vs	342 406 305 565 745
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J Rex vs. Lomann,	342 406 305 565 745
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J  Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs  Reed, Insurance Company vs  Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J  Rex vs. Lomamn,	342 406 305 565 745
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J Rex vs. Lomann,	342 406 305 565 745
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J  Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs  Reed, Insurance Company vs  Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J  Rex vs. Lomamn,	342 406 305 565 745
Minnie the, Marsh, vs	able Instrument—Words of negotiability—Special restriction on face of note—Contract of endorsement—Opinion per Porter, J  Reading Railroad, Sullivan vs Reed, Insurance Company vs Reed, Runyan vs Reeves vs. The Delaware Railroad Company—Negligence—Use of highway—Crossing highway at grade—General rule, where both parties are guilty of negligence, no recovery can be had—Ordinary care—Duty of traveller crossing railway at grade with turnpike—Opinion per Woodward, J  Rex vs. Lomamn,———————————————————————————————————	342 406 305 565 745

Rickit's Trust,	60 (	U.	
Right of suffrage of persons of Afri-		University of London vs. Yarrow-	
can descent,	123	Charitable trust—43 Elizabeth—	
Rodney vs. The Illinois Railroad-		Animal infirmary, 16	59
Constitutional law-Jurisdiction		• •	
-Constitution of the United		v.	
States, and constitutions of the		Vicksburg Railroad vs. Patton-	
separate States - Remedy-Re-		Common law in Mississippi modi-	
pugnant laws-Municipal regula-		fied by long established usage-	
tion-Territorial operation of laws		Effect of custom-Cattle in Missis-	
-Comity between the States-		sippi allowed to run at large on	
Subjects of property-Opinion per		the highways—Rights of owner of	
Skinner, J	439	unenclosed land—Exclusive use of	
Runyan vs. Reed—Promissory note		Railroad Company to railroad	
-Payment by makers before		track—Railroad Company's duty	
maturity—Its effect—Effect of		as to roadway and machinery—	
maker's endorsement—Bona fide		Mutual negligence — Evidence—	
holder-Notice-Evidence of pay-		Exemplary damages—Opinion per	
ment - Accommodation paper-		Handy, J 45	)7
Identity—Burden of proof—Opin-	202	Virden vs. Brig Caroline—Salvage	
ion per Sharswood, P. J	305	service—Steam tug—Rate of re-	
	1	muneration for salvage service—	
a		Character of salvage service—	20
S.		Opinion per Taney, C. J 25	
Calman Falls Ca Manaisa	504	Von Bomhorst, Nelson vs 15	)1
Salmon Falls Co. vs. Tangier,	0.1	W	
Shardlow vs. Newark Plank Road,	6	W. Wahatan na Dillan Smarifa manfan	
Shardlow vs. New Jersey Railroad,	926	Webster vs. Dillon—Specific perfor-	
Shaw, Born vs		mance — Injunction — Breach of	7.4
Siner's Appeal		Western Teleproph Co. Comp. vs.	. 12
Sieight vs. Lawson,	62	Western Telepraph Co.—Camp vs.	
Smyzer vs. The Minnie, Stewart, Wilson vs		—Transmission of Message-Mis- take—Terms of transmission—re-	
Sullivan vs. The Reading Railroad	014	peated messages—Negligence, 443,75	2.4
-Railroads as carriers of passen-	1	Wells vs. The New York Railroad—	,,
gers — The contract — Onus of	1	Special contract—Free passenger	
proof in Case of accident—Pre-		—Common carrier 71	13
sumption of fact—Negligence—		Williams vs. Coward, 31	
Killing of cow where no fence	Ì	Wilson vs. Stewart-When authority	
-Opinion per Woodward, J	342	is not revoked by the death of one	
Sun Mutual Insurance Co., Wright		of three trustees—Power to sur-	
vs	485	viving trustee-Future interest-	
	ĺ	Subsequently acquired title-	
$\mathbf{T}$ .		Opinion per Sharswood, P. J 37	$^{\prime 2}$
		Winter vs. The Delaware Ins. Com-	
Tangier, the Salmon Falls Co. vs	504	pany-Deviation-Abandonment	
Taylor's Administrators vs. Carryl		of voyage - Bottomry bond-	
- Possession of State officers		Breaking up of voyage-Port of	
under State process Writ of		repair-Opinion per Lowrie, C. J. 57	$^{\prime 2}$
foreign attachment — Vessel in	ĺ	Wright vs. Orient Insurance Co 48	
custody-Court of Admiralty-	j	Wright vs. The Sun Mutual Insur-	
Proceedings in rem-Authority	1	ance Co.—Same vs. The Orient	
of United States Marshal-Juris-		Insurance Co.—Lex loci contractus	
diction of the Admiralty-Void		-Policy underwritten in one	
order of sale by Court of Admi-	1	State upon cargo in another, and	
ralty—Effect of Marshal's sale—		loss payable in latter is governed	
Sheriff's possession—Opinion per	040	by that of former State—Construc-	
Campbell, J	040	tion of special clause in policy	
Dessenting opinion per Taney, Ch. J.		-Interpretation of language	
Telegraph Company, Camp vs443,		Rating of vessel—Opinion per	25
Tillett, Candler vs	58	Giles, J 48	) O
		v	
Trowbridge vs. Carlin,	69	Y. Vannous Huisensity of Landon va 49	25